DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 489 IR 012 605

AUTHOR Rapaport, David
TITLE Television Sports Violence: Factors Which Influence the Replay of Violence in Televised Sports.
PUB DATE May 86
NOTE 101p.; Master's Thesis, San Francisco State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Athletics; *Broadcast Television; *Decision Making; Interviews; Literature Reviews; News Reporting; Production Techniques; *Programing (Broadcast); Television Research; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS *Replays (Video)

ABSTRACT

Designed to identify the factors that influence the decision to use slow motion replays of violent sequences in televising sporting events, this master's thesis gathered data through a review of the literature of sports programming and personal interviews. Network policy statements, government reports, and public action committee reports were included in the literature studied, and interviews were conducted with both researchers who have studied the field and persons involved in the sports broadcasting industry, including producers and directors, network announcers, professional athletes, local commentators, and sports reporters. A critical perspective is adopted and two models are outlined to show the system under which broadcasters function in making such decisions. It was found that the economic imperatives of the industry conflict with idealistic general policy statements for the appropriate and responsible use of the medium of television, and that broadcasters reject the psychological implications of programming and research into effects of violent television. Several areas for future research are suggested, and a 96-item bibliography of books, journal articles, government publications, newspaper clippings, and unpublished papers is provided. (MES)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TELEVISION SPORTS VIOLENCE: FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCE THE REPLAY OF VIOLENCE IN TELEVISED SPORTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
San Francisco State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
degree

Master of Arts
in
Radio and Television

ED281489

DAVID RAPAPORT

San Francisco, California

May 1986

IR012605

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David Rapaport

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TELEVISION SPORTS VIOLENCE: FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCE THE REPLAY OF VIOLENCE IN TELEVISED SPORTS

David Rapaport
San Francisco State University
1986

Factors which influence the decision to replay violent sequences in sporting events are examined. A great deal of research exists on violence in general relationships to mass media. However, previous research on specifiable relationships between effect of slow-motion replays of violence on audiences is slight. Using personal interviews and reviewing literature, a critical perspective is adopted. A useful basis for this analysis is found in economic and organizational tendencies of major networks. The spectator and media critic has come to demand multi-angle replays in sports television, whether violent or not, and what broadcasters perceive as what viewers want is the bottom line.

I certify that the Abstract above is a correct representation of the content of this thesis.

5/1/86

Thesis Advisor May 1986

CERTIFICATION OF APPROVAL

I certify that I have read TELEVISION SPORTS VIOLENCE: FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCE THE REPLAY OF VIOLENCE IN TELEVISED SPORTS by David Rapaport, and that in my opinion this work meets the criteria for approving a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the Master of Arts in Radio/Television degree at San Francisco State University

Rick Houlberg
Assistant Professor

Larry Wittnebert
Associate Professor

Copyright by

David Rapaport

1986

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been completed without the help of Rick Houlberg, Larry Wittnebert, Janellen Smith, Lorene Seeler, Michelle Wolf and Heidi Winkler. I would also like to thank the following:

Jamin Zegart, Eric Levy, Susan Jay, Tim Chetin, Bob Kuether, Cynthia Louie, Bob Melrose, Ted Robinson, Lenny Lyons, Herb Kaplan, Alex and Michael Angell, Ron Tarrel, Wally Sound, Meg Streeter, Siouxsie Sioux, Ben Dover, John Doe & Exene, K.C. Murphy, Dr. Jennings Bryant, Ocean Restaurant, Clement Street, Steven Bochco, Naomi Jacoby, Liz Keim, Dick Axen, Anne-Marie Fox, Paul Lanier, Steve and Cletus Hudson, Mike Holland, Ed Jones, Charlie Golvin, Michael Gore, Jim Willson, Lee Ving, Iggy Pop, Glenn O'Brien, Julie Burchill, Tony Parsons, Mark Ibanez, Shingo Kamada, Andy Ellis, Al Robertson, Dave Anstead, Stan Bunger, Bob Agnew, Johnny Thunders, Patti Smith, Joey Ramone, Kirsten Hudson, Mary Haus, Tora Brooks, Pete Abitante, Rand and June Nathan, Tom Dallman, Brent Musburger, Gayla Weng, Kevin Campbell, Louisa Briccetti, Zack Barton, Cal Dean, John Cale, Nicky Beat, Joanne Masciale, Falco, and Sabrina Sayre.

DEDICATION

For Elliot and Vivian

PREFACE

"Insofar as (violence) is part of the show, certainly we sell it. If it ceases to exist, it will not be the same game..."

NHL President, Clarence Campbell

"I think that if we could suit up the whole world in football uniforms, maybe we wouldn't have any more wars..."

Jack Lambert, Linebacker

"Pro football is excessive. It's out of all proportion, beyond all bounds. It's an orgy of violence; an obsession with superiority; and excess of commitment, effort, and discipline, wallowing in flesh and will."

A Game of Passion, an NFL Publication

"There are enough real causes of trouble already, and we need not add to them by encouraging young men to kick each other on the shins amid the roars of the infuriated spectators."

George Orwell, 1945

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

MAJOR QUESTION 9

SUMMARY 11

METHOD AND DEFINITIONS 13

METHOD 13

LITERATURE REVIEW 14

PERSONAL INTERVIEWS 16

SUMMARY 22

DEFINITIONS 24

SUMMARY 32

FINDINGS 35

FACTORS INFLUENCING VIOLENT REPLAYS 35

PREVIOUS RESEARCH: A DILEMMA 44

NETWORK PERSONNEL ANSWERS TO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 47

NON-NETWORK PERSONNEL ANSWERS TO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 55

VIOLENCE AND PRODUCTION VALUES 58

VIOLENCE AND MEDIA EFFECTS 62

ACTION MEANS VIOLENCE 68

SUMMARY 71

DISCUSSION 74

SUMMARY 80

REFERENCES 86

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The instant replay was introduced to sports television by the production team of Tony Verna and Bill Fitts on December 7, 1963. "We originally put it in to watch Roger Staubach--Roger the Dodger, they called him--prance around," says Verna, a producer-director of 26 years (Quinn, 1978). As it turned out, Verna replayed a short run by another player while announcer Lindsay Nelson proclaimed, "This is not live, this is not live" (Nelson, 1984). In the 1980s, the instant replay has assumed a position of prime importance in sports television (Bayless, 1983). The replay is as much a part of football, baseball and sports coverage in general as the rules of the games themselves (Quinn, 1978). According to one sportswriter (Quinn, 1978), the question "How were the replays?" is perhaps the best indicator of whether a game was "good" or not.

Replays are used extensively as a routine part of sports coverage (Gentile, 1984). Indeed, more and more sports telecasts are relying on replays as the main vehicle of communication (Nelson, 1984). Sportswriters, re-

searchers and others have written about instant replays (McNally, 1978; Quinn, 1978; Livingston, 1980; Scannel, 1980; Bell, 1981; Bayless, 1983; Dickey, 1984; however, articles which mention the words replay or instant replay are invariably centered around the issue of using televised replays to aid the officiating process in the National Football League (NFL) (Bryant, 1984). Jennings Bryant, a leading sports violence researcher, submits the concept that the realm of officiating has received the lion's share of attention of both scholars and the press to the exclusion of other areas of interest. One such area is the study of the replay of violent sequences of sports play (Bryant, 1983).

The overall question of violent television content has been researched by many scholars, governments and television research bureaus (Gerbner, 1969, 1974, 1976a, 1978, 1980, 1981; Comstock, 1972, 1972a; Hirsch, 1980; Baker and Ball, 1969; Liebert, 1972; Bryant, 1982, 1983, 1984; US House of Representatives; Interstate and Foreign Commerce Commission, FCC Subcommittee, 1952 1; US House of Representatives, 8-17/18, 1976, 10-21, 1981; Rowland, 1983). Research "directions," the process of discovering ways to collate, analyze and substantiate hypotheses in the study of violence effects, began with the onset of modern communication, long before television made its dramatic debut

(Rowland, 1983, p.92). The advent of motion pictures created substantial public controversy about the effects of modern communication. Public opinion polling became an integral part of the research and political process in these early stages of the study of communication and marketing research methods gave rise to statistical and experimental methods (Rowland, 1983).

The Payne Fund studies of 1928-1933 came just before the Depression and at the peak of the postwar economic frenzy (Rowland, 1983). The National Committee for the Study of Social Values in Motion Pictures secured money for the study because, as its chairman put it, "...no one in this country up to the present time has known in any general and impersonal matter just what effect motion pictures have upon children... (Therefore) it's obvious that a comprehensive study of the influence of motion pictures upon children and youth is appropriate." (Charters, W.W. in Rowland, 1983, pp.92-3). The committee developed 12 studies and 18 well known educators, sociologists and psychologists drafted a general summary.

It took the better part of the next 18 years before more significant studies were to be completed and the question of violence was more thoroughly discussed. Though there was considerable controversy elicited by the

Payne Fund studies, it was widely felt that the studies were ignored by government as well as industry representatives (Rowland, 1983, pp.96-8).

The Harris Subcommittee was formed in 1952 barely a month after the FCC lifted the "freeze" on television stations that had been in effect since 1948. The US House of Representatives passed a resolution authorizing the FCC to conduct a full and complete investigation to determine the extent to which radio and television programs contained "...immoral and otherwise offensive matter, or place improper emphasis on crime, violence and corruption" (US House Interstate Foreign Commerce Comm., FCC 1932: 1). On the basis of such investigation, the FCC was authorized to make recommendations (including legislative action) to eliminate such undesirable programming as it deemed advisable (Rowland, 1983, p.99).

During the course of intermittent hearings, the subcommittee took testimony from a variety of broadcast critics and representatives. Unlike later hearings, when the issue of specific effects and the question of research evidence would become increasingly important, these hearings dealt with research only briefly (Rowland, 1983, p.99). Though the House initiated the 1952 hearings, by 1954, the US Senate assumed primary responsibility for the

scrutiny of television content. Although different subcommittees would shift responsibilities, Senate dominance would remain throughout the 1970s.

A special subcommittee created in 1954 to study juvenile delinquency would set the stage for the broadcast industry's classic position on violence research. That position argued that the relationship between television fare and influences on viewers tends to be extremely cautious. The subcommittee acknowledged that it did not have the kind of conclusive research that it wanted and some researchers explicitly warned that there were limitations involved in using social science as a basis for policy-making. (Lazarsfeld, in Rowland, 1983, pp.91-92.)

The Surgeon General's Committee on Television and Behavior has been publicly debating the question of violent television content in programming ever since they completed their comprehensive study in 1972. As one reads the final research, the tentative conclusion is that there is some preliminary indication of a causal relationship between televised violence and aggressive behavior. The reasons for this focus is that television is the most pervasive medium in the United States today, and television is violent. Expert social learning theorists like Bandura argued in this report that new acts of violence are

learned simply by observing those acts performed by a model, and that repeated exposure to such acts desensitizes the viewer to violence. Desensitization makes people more tolerant to violence and makes them more willing to commit new acts of violence. (U.S. House, 1972, p.14). However, this causality is criticized on the grounds that many of these premises were concluded under laboratory conditions which differ greatly from a "real-life" setting (pp.19-25).

A new National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) report published in 1982 under the auspices of the Surgeon General concluded that research then available yielded "some preliminary indications of a causal relationship, but a good deal of research remains to be done before one can have confidence in these conclusions" (Walsh, 1982, p.804.)

However, in magnitude, televised violence is as strongly correlated with aggressive behavior as any other behavioral variable that has been measured. The research question has moved from whether or not there is an effect to seeking explanations for the effect (Walsh, p.804).

The first key question is: if the replay is the chief tool by which broadcasters condense material to communi-

cate stories or action to viewers, which some suggest (Nettles, 1982; O'Donnel, 1982; Streeter, 1984; Gentile, 1984; Bryant, 1984, Miller, 1983), then why is the study of the effects of replays of violent sports action and the theory of their use somehow left out of discussions of the instant replay in sports? (Bryant, 1984.)

People talk about replays, therefore the subject exists as a social phenomenon. The effect that replays have on people is growing because more and more people are becoming involved in the sports television experience (Esslin, 1982). Given that millions of people view replays year-round (Nielsen, 1984) and that most, if not all, of the replays shown are of bone-jarring tackles (Bryant, 1984), it is possible that there is some effect on viewers. The government has conducted numerous investigations into the phenomena of violence effects and has issued reports including the testimony of hundreds of experts (Rowland, 1983). Journal articles, books, and newspaper articles have been written about violence effects (see Rowland, 1983, pp.308-319); NCTV News Vol. 4:3 May, 1983). Television programs and radio talk shows have devoted time to the subject of violence effects (ABC Viewpoint, 24 February, 1983; KCBS Radio, 26 May 1982; Donahue, 16 February, 1981).

All three major networks have departments which gather information on audience phenomena and the impact of television on society in general (Brown, 1975). Yet, there is wide disagreement in the academic community on the salience of arguments regarding violence effects (Rowland, 1983). However, one cannot dispute the importance of the interplay between the central figures involved in the policy debate over television content (Rowland, 1983).

The importance of the interplay between the policy maker, industry executive, communications researcher, legislative member and the public is that all must work together to create public policy (Pettigrew, 1979). The real question might be: which takes precedence - the public interest or private interests? (Brown, 1975, p.97).

In the case of replaying violence in sports television, it is the view of a number of broadcasters interviewed for this thesis (Musburger, 1984; Forte, 1984; Goodrich, 1984; Snyder, 1984; Gentile, 1984; Miller, 1983) that replays are there because the fans (or viewing public) want them there and to take them away would lower viewership. One noted that any adjustment of sports telecasts which would hurt ratings would be unacceptable (Musburger, 1984). Whether the replays are violent or not, reducing them is not the goal of sports broadcasters,

said one ABC producer (Goodrich, 1984), "There's got to be an awfully good reason why I can't show a replay. To me, there's no reason not to run any replay, unless it's just so, so absolutely outrageous as to jar the sensibilities." (Goodrich, 1984).

A major imperative of broadcasters is to hold the attention of as many viewers as possible (Smith, 1983). In order to accomplish this, producers ar expected to put a show together that has continuous interest to a highly disparate audience (Epstein, 1973, p.76). As one producer termed it, "...the only way to maintain 'holding power' is to show visual action, or pictures that are considered exciting..." (Epstein, 1973, p.43).

MAJOR QUESTION

The major question this thesis addresses is what factors influence the replay of violence in sports television? The term factors is defined as the directorial, production or aesthetic and social decisions which shape a broadcast. These factors interact in an environment which has organizational and economic imperatives (Bryant, 1984). In order to establish which, if any, factors influence the replay of violence, the "corporate climate"

under which sports broadcasters operate must be taken into account (Bryant, 1984).

The methods used in this thesis are a historical review of the literature of sports programming and personal interviews with key personnel in the Sports Broadcasting industry and researchers who have studied the field of sports programming. Rather than rely on one method to gather the information from this study, I have found it beneficial to utilize several research methods in order to supplant the base from which this study draws its conclusions.

Network policy statements, government reports and public action committee reports were collected. The "key personnel" interviewed for this study include the producers and directors for two of the major network football programs, Chet Forte and Bob Goodrich from ABC; Sandy Grossman, Bob Dunphy, Rick Sharp, Rich Gentile from CBS; network announcers Brent Musburger, Lindsay Nelson, and Jimmy "The Greek" Snyder; athletes Joe Montana and Randy Cross of the San Francisco 49ers; local commentators Ted Robinson and Bob Melrose of radio station KCBS; television sports reporter and ex-football player Tom Nettles; and researchers Jennings Bryant and Thomas Radecki.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have outlined the basic question which this thesis addresses, as well as the dynamic climate in which these processes exist. I have shown that replays are a basic tool by which broadcasters communicate information. I have shown that numerous reports exist on violence in general, though sports violence is somewhat overshadowed, and violent instant replays are somehow left out of discussions of the instant replay in sports broadcasting.

In Chapter 2, I will report the methods used to obtain information used in this thesis and I will define relevant terminology. I will address a working definition of the key players involved in the violent instant replay issue as well as a working definition of sports violence. That is, what are the characteristics of sports violence that distinguish it from other types of violence. I will also discuss what constitutes sports violence and the range of severity of replayed sports violence.

In Chapter 2, I will outline the findings of the research obtained by the methods listed in Chapter 2. Some of the problems within the social sciences which inhibit the study of sports violence and the debate over the im-

pact of televised violence will be used as a backdrop. I will introduce research findings devoted to the overall question of how broadcasters decide to choose material for production. The use of the instant replay as a production tool is explored with the battle for ratings in the highly competitive field used as a foundation. I will outline the economic and organization imperatives of sports television in order to better communicate the basic production values of the industry, and why replays are essential to successful sports programming. I will discuss how a broadcast is shaped by the members of the production crew and how the game is mediated by the technological devices employed by broadcasters.

Chapter 4 summarizes the previous chapters and draws conclusions from the evidence presented in Chapter 3. Several possible remedies to the problem of violent instant replays are suggested which may ease the burden that currently plagues sports violence researchers.

CHAPTER TWO

METHOD AND DEFINITIONS

In this chapter, I will outline the methods used to obtain the research material discussed herein. Working definitions of the terms "violence" and "sports violence" will be addressed as will the role of key players involved in the replaying of broadcast violence in sports programming. The relationship between replays of violence and the shaping of a broadcast by the members of the production crew will be discussed. The reliance on technological devices employed by broadcasters will be articulated and how these devices themselves come to affect a broadcast.

METHOD

Two methods were used in this thesis: a historical review of the literature of sports programming, and personal interviews with key personnel in the fields of sports broadcasting and social science research. Rather than rely on one method to gather information for this study, I have found it useful to utilize several research methods in order to supplant the base from which this study draws its conclusions. Previous social scientific research will be examined which utilize the methods of

content analysis, opinion polling and quasi-experimentation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A wide variety of sources was used to comprise this study. The National Coalition on Television Violence (NCTV) provided ample background on many of the key issues of violence in the media of the past 4 years. The Journals of Communication, Sport Behavior, Broadcasting, Sports Psychology, Human Relations, Social Psychology, Social Psychology Bulletin, Medicine and Science in Sports, American Medical Association, American Sociological Review and Social Behavior and Personality were consulted as was the New England Journal of Medicine.

The New York Times, Los Angeles Times, San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner, San Jose Mercury indexes were all used to locate pertinent articles by sportswriters and television columnists. The National Football League Press Office provided me with dozens of articles from newspapers around the country on the issue of replays in sports and violence.

A review of content analyses of sport broadcasts was completed which addressed the issue of violent action

(Bryant, Comisky, Zillman, 1982; Bryant & Zillman, 1983; Williams, 1977; Parente, 1977). There were no specific correlational studies available on the relationship between amount of violent action and use of instant replays.

The CBS News Index provided some useful information on broadcasts devoted to the study of violence in sports. However, the use of replays was not discussed. The Social Science Citation Index was an important source for locating journal articles by the wide variety of authors who have written on the issue of sports violence. Periodicals such as Sports Illustrated, Sporting News, Sport Broadcasting, Advertising Age, Panorama, People, Time, Newsweek, TV Guide, Columbine, and the 1984 CBS Sports Production Manual were examined.

Several excellent bibliographies, one in Rowland's Politics of TV Violence, the other released in 1983 by the NCTV, led to many pertinent studies and reports. The Congressional Index led me to hearings on the issue of sports violence and also to legislation regarding the imposition of stiff penalties for players found guilty of exceeding limits of the rules.

PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

The significant portion of the research for this thesis were the interviews conducted with network personnel regarding their own views of violence. They were asked the same series of questions taking into account their exposure to the decision making process (the questions were composed with the help of Jennings Bryant).

1) Is there a relationship between broadcast violence and unruliness of spectators?
2) Is there a relationship between replays of violence and the enjoyment of the event (game, sport)?
3) What factors, if any, influence (you) to request a replay whether violent or not?
4) Is there a feeling (on your part) that violence is a part of the game?
5) Is there a standard process or production method in deciding what action replays get more attention?
6) Does "action" mean violence?
7) What economic or organizational factors affect the use of replays?
8) Can events be broadcast with the deliberate exclusion of violent instant replays? Why? Why not?
9) Is the study of violent replays an area which requires more attention?

10) If replays and the use of videotape in general is the chief tool by which broadcasters communicate simultaneous events to the public, what is the objective of using violent replays?
11) What is the focus of most replays?
12) Do networks focus on violent behavior, i.e., giving more exposure or camera time to perpetrators of violence? Do aggressive players get more camera time? How is camera time allotted?
13) What is the purpose of voice-over compliments to violent action?
14) Is the present coverage of sports acceptable with regard to excess portrayal of violence?

After informing Dr. Bryant that I worked as a member of network sports production crews, and would continue to have access to production personnel, he believed that under the right conditions, I could get some extremely interesting "snippets of opinion." I did, in fact, have access, over a two-year period, to ABC and CBS network personnel and whenever I could find the right moment, I would ask for a couple of minutes from some director, associate director, or producer. Producers were a bit more difficult to approach, although I had some success.

In order to facilitate understanding the importance of the interviews, I have chosen to include more than the comments that pertain directly to the study itself. Quite often, respondents would talk about what they felt was important in the sports violence realm, but others still were somewhat uncooperative in revealing their interests or biases.

The following list of network personnel is divided into two subsections: The first is a brief biographical sketch of the respondent including qualifications in addressing the issue and a description of the circumstances of the interview; were all questions asked? Where did the interview take place?, What were the constraints involved?, etc. The second subsection is an accounting of the substance of the interviews (appears in Chapter 3). Answers to questions are summarized where possible, as tape recorders were strictly forbidden and even note-taking was often suspect. One interviewee thought I was a reporter and didn't believe that I was on the production crew until I convinced him otherwise.

Chet Forte - ABC Sports
Director, ABC's Monday Night Football
Interviewed December 12, 1984

I worked as Forte's runner during the game, so we had quite a bit of contact. However, I knew there was no way

to steal any time away from him then, so I approached him when he first arrived at the remote location. He was waiting for a scene to be set up, so I asked for some time. He responded by saying he'd answer a question or two "later."

Bob Goodrich - ABC Sports
Producer, Monday Night Football
Interviewed December 13, 1984

I approached Mr. Goodrich on December 13, 1984, a day before the game event. We spoke for several minutes outside the control truck. He was stern and had short rapid-fire answers for the questions asked. He was quite willing to discuss the use of replays and was adamant about the inclusion of replays for informational purposes.

Sandy Grossman - CBS Sports
Director, NFL on CBS
Interviewed December 28, 1984

As liaison between on-air talent and producer, I enjoyed unrestricted access to many top network personnel. During this event, the NFL TODAY program was being telecast from San Francisco, thus adding to the pool of potential respondents.

It was during this week in which I interviewed Grossman, Brent Musburger, Jimmy "The Greek" Snyder, and Bob Dunphy.

Brent Musburger - CBS Sports
Managing Editor, NFL Today
Interviewed December 27, 1984

I picked up Musburger at San Francisco Airport for the trip to the hotel. As another production runner drove to town, I asked Musburger if I could ask a few questions. He was extremely cooperative and brutally frank in his assessment of the issue of violence in sports. He had interesting and insightful comments on the comparison between film violence and sports violence. I was quite pleased with the results of my interview as he made every effort to contribute positively.

Jimmy "The Greek" Snyder - CBS Sports Analyst
Interviewed December 28, 1984

I interviewed "The Greek" while driving from Candlestick Park to his hotel. He was skeptical about the purpose of the interview and was, at first, reticent about saying anything. However, when he realized that I was a student, and therefore, to him, harmless, he opened up about the business of sports. He thought that my paper was on the use of replays to aid the officiating process. I'm not sure that he completely understood the purpose of the interview.

Bob Dunphy - CBS Sports
Director/Associate Director (in Charge of Replays), NFL Telecasts
Interviewed December 29, 1984

Dunphy worked as a director during regular season regional games and moved into the videotape truck to direct the replay unit during the playoffs.

I worked with him as a runner during the regular season, and felt I could approach him, especially since he was more in touch with the use of videotape than his usual role of establishing the shot-to-shot event for production.

Lindsay Nelson - CBS Sports
Commentator
Interviewed November 2, 1984

Nelson introduced the instant replay to sports television on December 7, 1963. When asked about the growth of replay and its function in the overall telecast, Nelson was extraordinarily lucid. I thoroughly enjoyed our interview, which took place while walking around the grounds of the Stanford Campus before a College Football telecast.

Rick Sharp - CBS Sports
Producer
Interviewed November 2, 1984

Sharp, who recently passed away, will be sorely missed by his peers. He was a talented and powerful force in broadcasting, who always expected his crew to maintain a

high level of concentration. I worked as Scoring Interlink on several of his productions; a position that the Producer especially depends on. The other college scores which are of great importance to regional coverage, such as Stanford or Cal, are the responsibility of the Scoring Interlink. The scores are recorded and displayed by computer, and I can remember Sharp making my life miserable by being so demanding on his choice of interest in scores.

He was interviewed while eating next to the trucks. It was just after a production meeting and before the crew really settled down to working on the fine points of organizing the broadcast. He had about two minutes together.

Ted Shaker - CBS Sports
Producer, NFL Today, NBA on CBS
Interviewed December 29, 1984

Shaker came up with the best one-liner defense of the argument against violence research. When asked about the reluctance to better define the use of violence in replays, Shaker said, ". . . what's there to define?"

SUMMARY

The findings outlined above will be discussed in Chapter 3. Who said what will be made clear and the reasons for the answers given will be explained. I will analyze

how their opinion fits into the big picture, that is, how the study of replaying violent incidents can be expanded by their comments and insights.

The responses will be as detailed as possible; however, certain limitations are inherent in this kind of informal interview scenario. I didn't want to contaminate the interview by introducing a note pad or tape recorder, which were strictly taboo. I was not always able to ask every question of every respondent, as is easily understood, given the limited time I had in which to elicit responses. I often would get data while in line for coffee, or in between scene set-ups, or whenever I could. This must be taken into account as the results of my interviews are interpreted.

DEFINITIONS

There is a wealth of information on violence in the broadcast media (NCTV, 1981-1985; Gerbner, 1984; NIMH, 1984; US Congress, 1982) though sports violence gets considerably less attention (Bryant, 1984). Therefore, it is important to construct a model of factors which influence the replay of violence in sports programs that encompasses the complexity of sports violence. In reviewing the studies cited herein and others claiming to correlate the viewing of violent behavior and subsequent aggressiveness, and especially in network policy statements, one fact becomes clear: not everyone is talking about the same thing when they refer to the generic term "violence" (Brown, 1975).

As it is most often used, the term refers to physical force used to injure, damage or destroy; extreme roughness of action (U.S. Congress, 1971). It is interesting, however, to note the distinctions between various definitions of violence. All three networks approach the question of violent content in programming much the same way they approach all sensitive subjects: they say one thing in official policy statements while their programming reflects little, if any, resemblance to this public image (Bryant, 1984). Regarding the treatments of violent material,

NBC's standards and practices guideline is admirable, though unenforced (Kaplan, 1983):

> Whether in terms of human conflict or cruelty to animals, violence should never be presented for its own sake, for shock effect, or as an audience stimulant and should never be carried to excess. Depictions of violence can be justified only to the extent essential to one advancement of plot or the depiction of characterization (Liebert, 1973, p.143).

The major concern of ABC with regard to television violence is that the audience not be shocked by its presentation. In an interview, one ABC official revealed four criteria for evaluating television violence:

1. No sensationalism merely to attract an audience;
2. Concern and awareness of the public's feelings;
3. Questions of public taste;
4. The desire not to generate a negative reaction in viewers (Casebier, 1978, p.213).

ABC defines violence as "a force or compelling threat of force resulting in harm to life. Violence involves harmful or anti-social consequences" (Lange, Baker, Ball, 1969, p.369).

CBS claims to take more care and show more concern about the presentation of violence in both adult and children's programming than do the other networks (Casebier, 1978, p.213). The head of CBS' standards and practices stated in an interview that "the nearest thing the network has to an expressed standard is that the network shall present as little violence as possible without interfering with the creative process" (Liebert, 1973, p.144). CBS' Office of Social Research is slightly more specific. It regards violence as "...the use of physical force against persons or animals, or the articulated, explicit threat of physical force to compel particular behavior on the part of a person" (Casebier, 1978, p.213).

Unfortunately, there are gaps in these definitions which leave unexplored the inherent physical contact in sports and are inflexible in allowing for the study of sports violence (Bryant, 1984). None of the current network policies defines sports violence per se. In fact, it may be argued that the fundamental purpose of sports programming, which is true for all programming, is to keep the audience in front of the set for the longest period of time (Skornia, 1965, p.23). This is accomplished by stimulating the audience under the premise that, if the program isn't stimulating, viewers will tune out (Brown, 1975, p.68). Unfortunately, the techniques used to

stimulate audiences often translates into screen violence, with the use of the term "action," in sports programming particularly, becoming synonymous with "violence," thereby justifying broadcasters' use of violent programming (Williams, 1977, p.141).

In sports programming, contrary to official network policy, violence is often presented for its own sake, not to keep audiences informed, or for purposes of clarification (Bryant, 1984). To the networks, it doesn't make business sense to promote their sports programming with "non-action" sequences (Williams, 1977, p.141). When creating a tease for an upcoming football game, it is normal procedure to use "action" sequences of archival footage, with voice-overs that bait the viewers, "...to watch the powerhouse Rams against the 'hapless' Eagles who want to give it to the Rams" (Williams, 1977, p.140).

The emphasis on violence presented in sports programming must serve a function (Brown, 1975, p.66). Network television, it may be argued, is based on the premise that ratings are the key element to success (Esslin, 1983, p.122). Factors such as the economic and organizational climate under which broadcasters operate are important to consider. There are no policies which unequivocally state that violence in televised sports is undesirable. In

fact, the networks hide behind the veneer of semantics when addressing the key issue of violence in sports, especially in their most popular game: football (Liebert, 1973, p.144). The networks argue that all those involved do so voluntarily and that no one forces them to participate in the event, either as a spectator or as an athlete (Musburger, 1984). Does this mean, however, that in order to voluntarily participate in such events, one must embrace or accept violence? (Bryant, 1984). Such questions have led to a fundamental reluctance to define sports violence. When asked about this reluctance, one CBS producer affirmed, "...what's there to define?" (Shaker, 1984).

Some have found the issue of sports violence worth definition. The NCTV supports a decrease in televised violence. It has monitored television content and published research which supports the view that TV violence causes subsequent aggression (NCTV 4:3, May 1983). The NCTV has conducted numerous investigations into the violent content of both dramatic and sports television. They define violence as "...the deliberate and hostile use of overt force by one individual against another" (Panorama, 3, 1981, p.14).

Gerbner, Dean of the Annenberg School of Communication, is a leading violence researcher and has made many contributions to the body of violence effects research. He has testified frequently in government hearings. He is perhaps best known for trying to establish a link between violence and influences on viewers. Through the use of content analysis he attempted to assign values to violent television content and conducted research examining the nature of violence on television and its impact on viewers (Gerbner in Baker and Ball, 1969; Gerbner in Surgeon General's report, 1972). Gerbner defines violence as "the overt expression of physical force against one's will of being hurt of killed, or actually hurting or killing" (Gerbner, unpublished manuscript, 1972). He says violence need not actually hurt or kill in order to be effective; it needs merely to create the fear of being hurt or killed so that people will obey or acquiesce to something they otherwise would not.

In boxing, football and hockey, there have been numerous incidents that could be classified under the NCTV definition. If applied to sports, the NCTV would surely call for the ouster of all major sports: football, hockey, and any sport which pitted one person or team against another. In fact, much of the pool of players who comprise the sport would in effect be outlaws, guilty of

violations against what is considered permissible by society both in real life and in the game situation (Tutko, 1979).

Smith (1983) clarifies the issue of developing a working definition of sports violence in a recent work that appears in a book titled Sports Violence (Goldstein, 1983). Smith forms a useful typology for operationally defining sports violence. Its use lies with the operational division of the spectrum of sports violence into four sub-categories: brutal body contact, borderline violence, quasi-criminal violence, and criminal violence (p.34). His definitions address the issue in a legalistic manner (NCTV, 5:1-2, January-February, 1982, p.3-4).

Operationally, brutal body contact translates to body contact performed within the official rules of a given sport: tackles, blocks, body checks, collisions, legal blows of all kinds. "Such contact is inherent," Smith argues, "in such sports as football, boxing, wrestling, ice hockey, rugby, lacrosse, and to lesser degrees in soccer, basketball and the like. Contact is an implicit part of the game legally referred to as consent" (p.34).

Smith's category of borderline violence is comprised of assaults, which, though prohibited by the official

rules of a given sport (and the law of the land), occur routinely and are more or less accepted by those concerned. Examples of borderline violence include the hockey fistfight, the late-hit and personal foul in football, the high tackle in soccer, the knock-down pitch in baseball, "body language" and the sometimes vicious elbowing and bumping that takes place in road and track races. This borderline violence is essentially the province of referees, umpires, and other immediate game officials. It is tolerated and justified on a number of grounds, most of which become some version of "part of the game" arguments (pp.34-5).

Quasi-criminal violence is defined as that which violates not only the formal rules of a given sport, but to a significant degree the informal norms of player conduct. It usually results, or may result, in serious injury, which is what brings it to the attention of top league officials and generates public outrage in some quarters. This public opinion (Horrow, R.B., Jnl. Legislation, 1982, 9:1-15), in turn, puts pressure on legal authorities to become involved (US Congress, 1981 Sports Violence Arbitration Act).

The category of criminal violence consists of acts so serious and obviously outside the boundaries of what could

be considered part of the game that it is handled from the outset by the law. Death is often involved. Almost always, such incidents, though closely tied to game events, take place prior to or after the contest itself. Smith concludes that "...what is called sports violence and what is not is no trivial matter. The extent to which a behavior is perceived as violence has a great deal to do with what people are willing to do about it" (p.35).

SUMMARY

Smith's definitions merit attention because they add a new dimension to the study of sports violence by relating sports to a more comprehensive role (Bryant, 1984). By dividing further, it may be argued that violent behavior includes two dimensions; the mode of violent behavior and the degree of legitimacy of the behavior (Gerson, 1968). In addition, not all violence is related to physical behavior (Esslin, 1982, p.39). For our purposes, "sports violence" may then be described more succinctly as the verbal or non-verbal intimidation of an opponent or person with the intent of hurting or disabling him or her either physically or mentally.

Violent acts need not be against the rules, rather they may be a tacit part of the game. Violent behavior

may be encouraged, or even rewarded in some circumstances. In other cases, the goal of violence is to conquer, dominate or control persons both physically and psychologically. Most sports violence is compelling violence, that is, it is extremely effective in controlling persons or situations (Smith, 1984, p.35).

In this chapter, I identified the methods used to gather research for this thesis. I defined relevant terminology, and addressed a working definition of sports violence. The key players involved in the issue of violence research and sports broadcasting were identified. The shaping of broadcasts editorially was briefly discussed.

Chapter 3 outlines the findings on the issue of what factors influence the replay of violence in televised sports, from the research obtained by the methods listed in Chapter 2. How a broadcast is shaped by the members of the production crew and how the game event is mediated by technology itself will be discussed. Research findings will be introduced which discuss the overall question of how broadcasters decide to choose material for production. The use of the instant replay as a production tool will be explored with the battle for ratings in the highly competitive market used as a foundation. The economic and

organizational imperatives of the broadcast industry will be addressed in order to better communicate the basic production values at stake. I will discuss the issue of "action" and violence, and note the dilemma that the lack of previous research has caused.

CHAPTER THREE

FINDINGS

In this chapter, the findings obtained by the author will be discussed. The economic climate under which the dynamic process of broadcasting takes place will be detailed first. Economics will be discussed solely in relation to the impact of removing violent replays from sports broadcasts. The controversial catharsis theory, that people may purge aggressive impulses through witnessing violence, is discussed and theories of causality between violence and subsequent aggression are addressed. The chapter is divided into five subsections with a summary. The subsections are

FACTORS INFLUENCING VIOLENT REPLAYS
PREVIOUS RESEARCH: A DILEMMA
PERSONAL INTERVIEWS
VIOLENCE AND PRODUCTION VALUES
VIOLENCE AND MEDIA EFFECTS
ACTION MEANS VIOLENCE

FACTORS INFLUENCING VIOLENT REPLAYS

In setting the stage for describing how broadcasters bring their violent messages to the public, it is essential to consider how the elementary definitions of violence come into practical use during production (Bryant, 1984). To maintain themselves in a competitive business,

the networks impose a set of restraints, rules, and conditions on the operations of their productions. Budgets are set, time is scheduled and sold, and general policies concerning content are laid down. Broadcasters are licensed to provide a program service that should behave at all times in "the public interest, convenience and necessity" (US Congress, 1934). However, the pressures of capitalism and executives' fear of making mistakes clash with this notion often yielding not what the people want, but what the broadcast industry finds most profitable to produce (Brown, 1975). Thus, the first and main factor of influence in determining the practical use of violent replays is economically based (Bryant, 1984):

> Two factors seem to have affected the decision finally made regarding what broadcasting would do about sports: First of all, industry wanted to promote those sports which would keep the television viewer in front of the television set for long periods of time; this required pushing big spectator sports. Second, the profits in the big sports were more promising (Skornia, 1965, p.125).

The producers of televised sports have demonstrated their ability to interpret games and events, but should games and events be interpreted? The production of an event is as competitive as the event itself, in different ways (Esslin, 1983). The competition for advertisers often takes precedence over the public interest for the

simple reason that advertisers write the checks that keep broadcasters in the black (Smith, 1983, 88).

> Television is not only a program service but an advertising medium which operated in a framework of intense competition. The principal value television has to offer an advertiser is an audience, and the rating services furnish us and our advertisers with the measurement of the audience generated by our programs. This is a business requirement of broadcasting, essential in soliciting and justifying the advertising expenditures that support our program service (Epstein, 1973, p.78).

"Television stations recruit an audience for advertisers, which is not difficult since they have what amounts to a government-protected monopoly over a limited number of channels in an area, or market" (Epstein, p.79). In turn, advertisers buy minutes of time on these programs to convey messages to potential customers. The stakes in the game of televised violence are enormous (Radecki, 1984). Understandably the industry is opposed to anything which would endanger this source of revenue (Goodrich, 1984). Thus any reduction of replays in sports would be considered a reduction of program "quality," and advertisers wouldn't be as likely to invest in such a program when they can be assured of a better "quality" program elsewhere (Bryant, 1984).

Another factor to consider in the practical use of violent replays is the perception that human beings are inherently violent and thus enjoy violent programming on television. When asked about the trend towards more violent programming which the networks seem to be supporting (Atyeo, 1979), executives often rely on their most potent defense of violence on television: the notion that "...it's what the public wants, so we broadcast it" (Atyeo, 1979, p.166). This position is echoed by athletes and researchers alike (Brown, 1975; Zillman, 1977; Parente, 1977; Comstock, 1978; Bryant, 1980, 1981; Radecki, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985). An ex-football player remarked, "On a Sunday afternoon the fans get to screaming and they want to see somebody get hit...it's just football. That's why it's the number one sport" (Atyeo, 1979, p.166).

Comstock analyzed the claim that humans are attracted to violence while addressing a key difference between violence broadcast during the news and "entertainment" violence. The arguments that all media are violent or that television is violent because society is violent are truisms, but hide important distinctions (Comstock, 1978, p.125).

> "News, although a concoction from available events, must be somewhat obedient to them. Entertainment need not be, either in principle or, in the case of violence in prime-time drama, in fact. Despite obvious similarities, the various media differ sufficiently in their communicatory properties, their audiences, and their economics for us to believe that it is necessary to explain the frequency and pattern of violence by specific factors operating in each case. Similarities, not differences, may be explained by such slogans as a human need for vicarious violence. What has given "television violence" its prominence as a subject of concern, in addition to the medium's ubiquity, vividness, and daily command of the public's attention is its independence from any necessity other than the character and economics of the industry (Comstock, 1978, p.125).

Practically speaking, on-the-spot broadcast decisions are far removed from executive boardrooms and take place in the atmosphere, which the networks readily accept, that violence is a part of the game and that violence wouldn't be so popular if people didn't like the violence; that it's what they want (Bryant, 1984 personal communication). That kind of reasoning places all network programming under suspicion for the simple reason that the underlying premise of sports television and all television, it may be argued, is to keep the ratings up, and a tacit part of maintaining high ratings is broadcasting the "best possible game" with the "best possible coverage" (Gentile, 1984). Many broadcasters argue that the game event cannot be broadcast successfully without the inclusion of the

slow-motion instant replay, whether violent or not, for the sake of informational purposes (Musburger, 1984; Gentile, 1984; Goodrich, 1984; Dunphy, 1984). "The audience demands it" (Goodrich, 1984).

In support of this claim, the networks argue that if viewers are offended by programming they should turn the channel (Koppel, ABC Viewpoint, 1983; Reasoner, ABC Viewpoint, 1983). It is difficult, however, to precisely evaluate this. Two important points should be made which bear directly on audience preferences. The first is that besides fulfilling people's desires for acquisition of information and for entertainment purposes, mass media may give people "lessons" or "models" on which they may base their behavior (Bryant, 1984). Television also serves as a babysitter (Smith, J., 1983). This companion function may help people who are alone for long periods of time, acting as a substitute for the presence of other people (Michaels, 1984). The point here is that television is not used solely for the appeal of entertainment of informational content. A variety of factors that may essentially be unrelated to the particular program content may result in television viewing (Esslin, 1982, p.66).

The second point to consider is that television viewing, like newspaper reading, may be a habitual activity

(Bryant, 1984). However, as argued by one researcher, if the level of "excitory habituation," the amount of violence needed to excite viewers to a new level of enjoyment, keeps rising, then isn't it logical to conclude that viewers will become potentially more aggressive, or at least less sensitive to graphic and spectacular acts of violence? (Bryant, 1984.)

A good example lies in televised drama in which the audience has witnessed so many murders and killings that death is accepted unless there is a new twist (Bryant, 1984). Indeed, "the audience can merely look at their watch and know that the hero is going to resolve the conflict at hand because there's always next weeks' episode..." (Bryant, 1984). The networks want programming to be desirable for all types of viewers and have concluded that a high-action style of presentation is the vehicle that will enable <u>their</u> coverage of a given event to stand out (Baker & Ball, 1974).

Williams (1977) explored the structure of televised football, outlining the essence of the football telecast itself and the degree to which television mediates the game event. He argues that the action imposes certain production decisions, which basically make up the broadcast. Basic show structure, camera placement, and use,

shot selection, editing and special effects, replays, picture content and graphics, were examined by means of a content analysis of six National Football League games. These production decisions came to be, Williams argues, because the game was televised, concluding that the televised game has its own structures, its own unity and points of reference and emphases (p.136).

He noted that themes developed because of the action of the game (p.137). Mediating influences included the focusing on individuals rather than the team; most noticeably the commentary highlighting individual efforts through name identification rather than the team; different camera techniques or deployments and number and use of announcers (p.138).

He developed the idea that pre-game shows relate to the theme of rivalry and the characterization of a team, "...the powerhouse Rams against the 'hapless' Eagles...who want to give it to the Rams" (p.140). His evidence suggests that the televised coverage of a live, unscripted event such as a football game imposes its own structures and provides its own ideological viewpoints.

Snyder (1983, p.223) argues that the nature of the television camera has contributed to the visual imagery of

sport, and not always in a positive way. "Through the electronic eye, we have become accustomed to specific segments of athletic performance being isolated, blown up, slowed down and repeated, and otherwise detached from the overall sport configuration" (p.224).

Snyder cites Cummings (1975) work in restating the role of the replay, "Sport provides heroic images and television provides these images with exposure...The phenomenon of the replay is related to both our penchant for stopping time, reliving great moments, holding them in immortal tape present...and to our need for expert analysis, to see it again to make sure (p. 76).

This new reality provided by television is dramatically described by ex-Green Bay Packer football player Jerry Kramer:

> Over and over and over, perhaps 20 times, the television cameras reran Bart's touchdown and my block on Jethro Pugh. Again and again millions of people across the country saw the hole open up and saw Bart squeeze through. Millions of people who couldn't name a single offensive lineman if their lives depended on it heard my name repeated and repeated and repeated...All I could think was "Thank God for instant replay" (Kramer, 1968, p.262).

Repeatability is a fundamental aspect of broadcasting drama in sports (Esslin, 1982, p.114). Since the events on sports television have been filtered through various stages of the production process, gathering, the selective framing of material, editing to emphasize drama, manipulation of time, space, audio, special effects, etc., the end product is able to withstand close scrutiny and incessant repeatability (Esslin, 1982, p.114). By the time some news or sports events have been shown several times, they have acquired the characteristics of a dramatic performance. Thus even bizarre, unrehearsed events, such as the murder of Lee Harvey Oswald, or the injury to Daryl Stingley, became endlessly repeatable, artifacts of high drama (Esslin, 1982, p.114).

PREVIOUS RESEARCH: A DILEMMA

From the evidence gathered for this thesis, one may conclude that completed research is dominated by two key issues: The economics of televised sports and psychological "effects" models which attempt to ascertain the impact of televised violence on viewers. Unfortunately, these two areas often obscure other areas of research which possess important characteristics worthy of attention in the overall study of the relationship between violence and televised sports. While "experts" continue to disagree

over questions of causality and generalizability in violence research, broadcasters continue to condone the display, repetition, and promotion of the most violent of sports as a functional part of their broadcasts (Bryant, 1984).

One of the most significant disagreements between violence researchers surrounds the widely publicized work of Gerbner. Gerbner's research is somewhat limited in its generalizability because news, documentaries, specials, variety programs and sports were not included in the analyses. Many critics suggest that he should have randomly selected a number of programs from a series for coding rather than coding only one episode (Owen, B., 1972; Coffin, T.E. & Tuchman, S., 1972-73; Blank, D., 1977, Wurtzel A. & Lometti, G., 1983). The "violence profile" or rating is as controversial a study as any in the field (Bryant, 1984).

In a review of Rowland's 1983 book "The Politics of TV Violence," the platform from which research is presented is criticized. The Congress is also criticized, as Gerbner says, as that body which ignores the evidence of its own hearings, shifting the source of the problem from the networks structure to the parents of America. Throughout the history of government hearings, says

Gerbner, "...the TV networks have used corrupt practices to control (them)." (Gerbner, Journal of Communication, 34(3):164-175). Despite what Gerbner cites as "overwhelming evidence of harm" (p.166), "the commercialized TV industry uses its tremendous political power to assure that the American people do not get honest information about the TV violence problem..." (Gerbner in NCTV 6:1-2, 1985, p.4).

Gerbner's latest position in the debate over violence effects research is that although researchers have tried to provide the connection between violence and influences, the political game that Congress and the FCC play with the networks renders all causal research null and void (Gerbner 1984, p.175). It is the lack of aggressiveness on the part of government panels and the apparent reluctance of the networks to remain unbiased which makes it so hard to study violence effects (Radecki, 1985). This position could explain the lack of a foundation of sports violence research (Bryant, 1984). Network sport broadcasts are highly profitable (Gentile, 1984). To endanger this potential revenue source by changing formats "unnecessarily" is simply out of the question (Nelson, 1985). Sports broadcasters invariably feel that there "is no (violence) problem to study..." (Goodrich, 1984).

The study of sports violence is also somewhat overshadowed by the emphasis researchers have placed on violence in general. In government studies, network policy statements and in the academic community the realm of sports violence is rarely considered important enough to mention. Though the NFL provided dozens of newspaper articles for this thesis, replays and sports violence were never discussed as being related. Every article involving replays as centered around the issue of using replays to assist the officiating process. The issues of violence were varied from fan violence to excess violence on the field, yet at no time was any association or discussion developed between these types of violence and television replays.

NETWORK PERSONNEL ANSWERS TO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The following are the verbatim transcripts (where possible) of the interviews outlined in Chapter 2.

Chet Forte - ABC Sports

Forte was unable to spare any time after initially reacting favorably to answering a few questions.

Bob Goodrich - ABC Sports

#3) "There's got to be an awfully good reason why I can't show a replay... any replay. To me, there's no reason not to run any replay unless it's just so absolutely outrageous as to jar the sensibilities."

#8) "Replays are there because fans want them there. To just arbitrarily reduce replays would take away from the broadcast. They're there because the audience demands it."

#9) "Face it guy, for what you're studying, there is no (violence) problem to study. Maybe in news there's objectionable clips but not on Monday Night Football."

Sandy Grossman - CBS Sports

#7) "All you need to remember is the bottom line it's a business...a helluva business. Remember that and everything else will follow."

Brent Musburger - CBS Sports

#1) "I think that a certain element of fans will do anything when they get caught up in the frenzy of games. It's not that much of a problem in the United States, but soccer fan violence I can see

as a major difficulty. It has nothing to do with whether the violence is broadcast or not."

#2) "I think people want violence. They make a guy like my man Clint Eastwood who he is... pay their money... I think if people want to see action, they turn to football. It's great entertainment... at least millions of people think so."

#4) "These athletes are tough. They train, work their whole lives for a place in the spotlight... or some internal satisfaction. Football happens to be a rough game. That's what it is. That's how you describe football. It's no tea dance."

#5) "Well... anything that hurts ratings is out. Anytime you can knowingly hurt ratings and you choose that path, what can I say... it's not very wise if you want to keep working. Replays are a great way of extracting the feeling and high points of games, and without taking up a lot of viewer decisions. What I mean is, they can see four or five short replays and think that they have watched that many games... at least it seems that way."

#6) "There's nothing to get worked up over if games are rough. No one forces athletes to participate... they are... we are all here, you're caught up in it yourself. Action means movement.

In football, that means tackling. It doesn't mean mayhem."

#7) "We want to show the most complete coverage available. We want to take the lead, so to speak. I think we are in the lead. Our organization seems to work, so I don't see the need to tamper with it for the sake of a few hard tackles."

#8) "Listen my man, I think that if you take replays out, you automatically make your product inferior - that should be obvious - if someone misses the key play or plays of a game, they should be allowed to expect that we'll show it to them again. To see the kind of moves these players are capable of making only once is criminal... I want to see that catch slowed down. I think fans absolutely would turn off if you take that element out. You can't tell me that if Joe Montana is knocked out of a game fans don't want to see the play again... how he was hurt. I mean he's tough, it would take a hard shot to put him on the sidelines. These fans would be screaming for replays... Could you imagine ignoring it? Or a touchdown catch that had a rough ending? It'll never happen."

#9) "Listen my man, I've watched more football than just about anybody. It hasn't turned me into a mass murderer. I don't consider myself violent. I think part of the problem is the kind of expectations that those who pose questions about violence have on their minds. Take a look at news, drama, movies... you're worried about a quarterback sack? With all the handguns available?"

Jimmy "The Greek" Snyder - CBS Sports

#8) "You can't eliminate replays, especially if the rough and tumble stuff is in there. That's what the fans want. To take that away would be suicide for a network. That's why fans bring TVs to the games with them."

#14 "I think boxing has a lot of problems with bouts being manufactured and such, for television, but football is the greatest sport in America, and there aren't any real problems with it."

Bob Dunphy - CBS Sports

#8) "You have to have replays. Without interrupting the flow of a game, or miscuing a play... that's the only problem with replays."

#9) No. Fans aren't looking for knowledge. They want release."

#10) "There's nothing wrong with aggressiveness. It plays really well. It makes for more interest. We just replay what has already taken place."

Lindsay Nelson - CBS Sports

#7) "They'll never change formats... unless they perceive it to hurt ratings. If they felt it would hurt ratings, there's no telling what they'd do. They'll try anything to outthink audiences, but they won't write their own epitaph, so changing replays is out of the question. Broadcasts won't change very much anyway, the system is too slick."

#8) "Replays are an absolutely essential part of sports telecasts. We never dreamed it would be what it is today, but yes, it is an awfully convenient way to cut down on a lot of boring plays and concentrate the action. Many people have approached me because of what we used to take out of the old Notre Dame telecasts... although I'm a bit tired of being reminded of the phrases I used to go between segments (we now move to further action in the same series of plays... or... Notre Dame couldn't move the ball and was forced to punt)."

Rich Sharp, CBS Sports

#8) "There is just no way to show a game without using all your resources - it's just asinine to argue that people get more violent from watching quarterback sacks. They get violent for plenty of other reasons than to poke around football games for some mysterious violence problem. If you think there's such a problem in football, I'd hate to hear your thoughts on boxing. It's a game. It's a tough game. There's not much more I can say about it. I think you have the wrong emphasis though, at least as far as I'm concerned. Replays are being added because officials aren't capable of calling games these days. So, replays will be added to make calls. Reducing tough hits... what are you saying anyway, not show replays of sacks or injuries? It's entertainment. It's information. The fans want it. That's why it's evolved the way it has."

Rich Gentile - CBS Sports

#4) I want to work on exciting games. Football is exciting because of what it is, because of great players and matchups. There are some players who just get into it, intimidators. The game needs these guys."

#7) "Replays are used so routinely as a part of coverage that to have crappy replays means to have a crappy game. Replays of rough plays or great catches are the same. They give the fans a chance to experience the event again. Replays are a great format. That's why fans like them, have come to appreciate them. They see their player, like Dwight Clark, make an impossible catch and it's a memory."

#8) "I want to work on games I'd like to watch myself. Fans demand replays, I demand replays. It's stupid to think that you can broadcast games without them. It can't be done."

#9) "Officiating and replays is an area which should get another look."

#10) "I don't like the question, covering the game is the story, and if you don't have replays to complement the story that the announcers have set up, then you look stupid."

#12) "I think there are obvious reasons why it's more fun to watch the quarterback or the linebackers than the center."

#13) "Some people like to hear the announcer go "Boom" when a player gets tackled... I don't give it much thought. These questions are getting kind of weird... you know... if you don't babble on

like some announcers then it doesn't matter. That's all that people complain about announcers."

#14) "Fans expect replays to show them the angles they they couldn't see as a fan in attendance. We're supposed to compete for the 50-yard line seat in a way. The look of a broadcast has to be clean. Replays help clean it up, make things easy to set-up and understand... and the fact is there are a whole lot of people who just don't understand. They just like football. Fans want to see replays if their team wins, they don't want to see replay recaps if they lose... make sense?"

NON-NETWORK PERSONNEL ANSWERS TO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Jennings Bryant, Ph.D.
Researcher, Sports Violence
Indiana University
Interviewed January 16, 1984

Bryant gave me a series of interviews on the topic of what factors influence networks to replay violence. He was interested in the issue as he had not heard of a study which directed itself to this specific question. On January 16, 1984, five days before the Super Bowl, we spoke at length and formulated the basis for the interview questions to be asked as the situation called for it. He

urged me to keep as copious notes as possible as these could prove to be very informative sessions.

Thomas Radecki, M.D.
NCTV Chairperson
University of Illinois School of Medicine
Interviewed January 19, 1984

Radecki leads the NCTV, a group committed to the reduction of levels of violence on television and in films. He offers some unique interpretations of the harmful effects of violence and has urged the FCC and Congress to conduct hearings on the increased promotion of violence and sports violence by the major networks and cable industry.

Joe Montana - San Francisco 49ers
Quarterback

Randy Cross - San Francisco 49ers
Lineman/Center

I had the opportunity to ask both Montana and teammate Randy Cross a question on the issue of violence in televised games while Cross was hosting a radio program on station KCBS. The program aired May 26, 1982. I asked Montana if he felt different playing nationally televised games as opposed to regionally televised games. I followed up by asking if there was any special emphasis the team may have for these games. I also asked, although it wasn't answered, if he felt he was a victim of the

coverage a player of his stature endures. Montana said television games were easier to set up for and built an air of excitement about performing well - you didn't want to look bad. Cross echoed his views.

Ted Robinson and Bob Melrose - KCBS Radio

These gentlemen were thoughtful enough to take time to help out on this paper. Both are very knowledgeable in the field, and Ted, as host of the KCBS Sports Magazine, would do his best to elicit remarks pertinent to my study whenever he could. Melrose had a few choice words to offer on the subject of violence and legislation. Robinson is now Sports Director at KCBS.

Wally Miller
Sports Producer

Miller produces the very popular 49ers pre-game telecasts which air on KPIX in San Francisco. One particular segment of the show highlights the toughest tackles and often the roughest play and is called "Bright Spots." Miller was kind enough to contribute a videotape of a "Bright Spots" segment for my use. I am grateful to him for his accessibility and courtesy in providing materials. Miller said that his segment was "simply 4:27 of people getting smoked... the fans love it."

Tom Nettles - KRON TV
Sports Reporter

Nettles also provided me with videotape material of outrageously violent incidents that had been strung together and run with a whimsical musical accompaniment.

VIOLENCE AND PRODUCTION VALUES

The camera positions, shots, amount of time devoted to slow motion replays, the selection of various technical effects are all under the preview of the producer/director team. These are the units of language by which the meaning and nature of the mediated event are clarified and intensified (Zettl, 1984). In dissecting the decision-making process, the role of the slow-motion replay becomes clear. It is up to the producer and director to put the broadcast together in an exciting, clear and action-packed style (Sharp, 1984). Viewers expect the average broadcast to include replays from every possible angle (Hewitt, 1984). Anything less is a disappointment (Cohn, 1983).

The action of a game or event is heightened by the entire production crew with state-of-the-art technology at their fingertips. Their main function is to mediate the game, that is, do what they can to make the viewers see and hear the "best" possible interpretation of the events being presented by virtue of the selective editing and

framing of the aural and visual elements present (Gentile, 1984). For camera operators that means always giving the director the best possible shot. For veterans, this is usually done without the need for a command. For producers, directors, technicians, assistants and even gophers, "covering" the game event means putting together the best possible elements to produce a program that they themselves would like to watch at home (Gentile, 1984).

Since sports are live "unscripted" events, the production process manipulates the game and the participants, both viewers and athletes, turning the viewers into aggressive seekers of violence and turning the athletes into dramatic fantasy figures closely akin to those in a play (Esslin, 1982). Now with the viewer closer than ever, the athletes are given the stage in which to display superhuman feats of strength and endurance forever captured in magnetic immortality (Esslin, 1982).

Esslin writes:

> In the sphere of excitement, however, there operates a law of diminishing returns: The more accustomed viewers become to violence, the more the violence has to become to make an impact...Violence produced "good" television. And...because editors...are constantly in pursuit of stories that have a strong visual and dramatic element, violence is assured of a central place (in television)...but that is by no

> means the most important aspect...the drama, the intensity of the suspense, and the potential of the unfolding events, especially at the moment of the final assault, can be fully and minutely shown on the TV screen (1982, p.62).

The dilemma of sports broadcasts is that they are supposed to be unscripted events, wholly spontaneous and not prefabricated.

> But at the same time a sports broadcast contains a considerable degree of staging: the event itself is anticipated and planned, the various cameras are carefully positioned at strategic points during the broadcast. The director will cunningly cut from one camera to the other, from long shot to close-up, from one end of the field to the other, from rapid "live" action to the slow-motion replay (p.13).

The replaying of violent incidents by networks is not confined to sports programming as Epstein (1973) point out. Indeed, it is beyond the scope of this paper to examine in detail the decision-making process as a whole; however, the framework of the networks, as discussed by Epstein, shows that the correspondents, producers, and technicians shape the images they come in contact with with their own personal tendencies and preferences.

The final control is in the editing room. As one NBC producer point out, "There is a three-stage distillation of news footage. Producers seek out stories with a high

potential for action. Within these stories, cameramen seek out the most action-packed footage; and editors concentrate the action (Epstein, 1973, p.179). The edited product of this distillation process often takes the form of a vignette (Epstein, p.186).

In televised sports, vignettes take the form of gladiator-like combat with the social effects of television magnifying the drama and embellishing the scene (Esslin, 1982, p.87). Unfortunately, network programmers have decided that to attract huge segments of the audience which support the investing advertisers with their purchases, the least common denominator must be emphasized to increase audience involvement (Smith, J., 1983). The addition of televised violence has been thought to attract large numbers of viewers, thus broadcasters are reluctant to experiment with programming that might easily alienate the majority of the audience, which could be attracted with violence (Howitt, 1975, p.23). Indeed, sports broadcasts are editorially shaped in order to accent the successful use of violence and keep the screen filled with "action" (Bryant, Comisky & Zillman, 1981).

Viewers of televised sports are attracted to much more than just the action on the field. The violent vignettes and contact which the networks emphasize routinely, as

evidenced by the predomination of slow-motion violence, add color to the regimental blandness in sports. This is chiefly what producers work against (Yeager, 1979, p.129). Furthermore, it is argued that as Americans spend more and more time watching acts of violence on sports television they become habitually narcotized to is its presentation, and it is precisely this habit which broadcasters use to manipulate audiences with the sole intent of providing large heterogeneous consumers for advertisers (Bryant, Zillman, 1983).

VIOLENCE AND MEDIA EFFECTS

The interpretation of the violent signals contained in a sports broadcast falls into the realm of media analysis relying heavily on psychological "effects" models, which ultimately try to ascertain the impact of violence on the viewer (Tutko, 1979, p.34). A preponderance of research exists on the question of the impact of media on viewers; however, the methods used often lack reliability (Tan, 1981). The generalizability problems of effects models are widely accepted in the field (Tan, 1981, p.6) but measures are being taken to rectify the undesirable qualities of this type of research, while not disputing the theoretical basis from which its conclusions are drawn (Tan, 1981, p.55).

Most of the early effects research consisted of historical, legal and content analyses of the mass media. There were no models which could adequately address the effects of the media, nor were demographics very well understood. In the 1930s and 40s, researchers from other disciplines, primarily social psychology, formulated a model of the powerful influences of the media. According to this "powerful effects" model, the mass media could bring about just about any kind of effect on their passive audience (Tan, 1981, pp.3-4).

Others analyzed the effect of mass media on decision making which provided the basis for what has become known as the "limited effects" or "reinforcement" model of mass communication (Tan, 1981, p.6). Lazarsfeld found that the mass media had very little direct effect on voters during political campaigns (1949). The main effect was the reinforcement of existing attitudes, and the small percentage who did change were more likely to be affected by personal communication sources (opinion leaders) than by the mass media (1949). This model gradually replaced the "powerful effects" model and in the late 50s there was a resurgence of the "powerful effects" model. How can one model be appropriate yesterday and invalid today? An historical explanation suggests that the effects of mass communication on society can be best understood by analyzing the pre-

vailing social and political climate of the time (Tan, 1981, p.6).

A second explanation for this shift from powerful to limited and again to powerful lies in the methods themselves. We are often able to observe communication effects in the laboratory (an artificial research setting), with the researcher in almost complete control, but not in a real-life setting. Thus it is easier to change attitudes in the laboratory, as Hovland and his colleagues did, where effects are often short-term, than in the community (Tan, 1981, pp.5-6).

In what ways have researchers found it beneficial to think about the nature of media effects? Catton (1968) traced the evolution, implications and findings in the shift from research on media effects on mass audiences toward a model concerned with how audience members receive and use mass media content. In the process, he reviewed past and contemporary classifications of effects, noting the importance of "intervening variables" in the communicative process, and sensitizing the media reader to new conceptions of effects by referring, for example, to the "opportunity cost" of the abundance of violence portrayed by the media. In this latter connection, he asserts that the presentation of violence by the mass media does affect

the behavior of the mass media audiences; it keeps them from using in their own ways whatever other kinds of content that might have been presented in the same time slot (Catton in Larsen, O., 1969).

Catton also offers a broader interpretation of sociological factors in this context. He contends that the eliciting effect is far more likely than the cathartic effect. In doing so, he reminds us that evidence that media operators are good people and have no desire to promote violence cannot suffice to prove that mass communications either cannot or do not produce increases in violent behavior. By providing cues that violence is socially acceptable, mass media may inadvertently both elicit and disinhibit violent behavior (Catton in Lange, Baker and Ball, 1969, p.301).

The question of whether witnessing mass media violence tends to facilitate or purge the impulse to aggression is one of the most controversial areas of media research and should command special attention far beyond the reach of this paper. However, it is the key impact question and has been at the center of considerable intellectual debate with a large and growing number of laboratory experiments addressing the issue. Catharsis, or "draining off" is often cited as a healthy release of aggression, and a

reason why it is okay to view violent televised sports (NCTV, 1983, 1:4-5). This is an area of much misconception.

Goransen's research provides a review of the evidence from laboratory studies on the issue of catharsis. His general conclusion is that this line of research has not supported the idea that the probability of aggressive behavior is reduced by observing the kind of violence seen in the mass media. He adds that the vast majority of experimental studies on this issue have reported media aggression as stimulating rather than proving aggression catharsis (Goransen in Lange, Baker and Ball, 1969, p.237).

Goransen points out some of the more specific points which studies suggest about the variety of conditions under which the observation of violence tends to increase rather than decrease subsequent aggressiveness (p.244). Despite laboratory evidence, the question of "stimulating vs. cathartic effects" remains an issue in mass media research. It should be emphasized that researchers contend that reductions of aggressiveness can be explained without any reference to a cathartic "draining off" of aggressiveness. Such inhibition to acting out aggressiveness occurring after media exposure results from "...the

reminder that aggression is morally wrong (especially in the case where media violence is portrayed as unjustified) and when the subjects were made aware of the painful aftermath of aggression" (Goransen in Larsen, 1968, p.244).

Among the many effects oriented studies, few have articulated the salient issues as well as Comstock. His classic (1978) study on television and behavior summarized the complex issue of aggression caused after viewing televised violence while also addressing the biggest methodological stumbling block to this causal relationship:

> Television violence under certain circumstances is capable of reducing subsequent aggressiveness, but the cause appears to be inhibition following upon anxiety over aggression rather than catharsis. The quantity of studies which consistent results provide considerable confidence about the relationship between televised violence and subsequent aggression, but the studies do not provide direct evidence on whether television contributes widely or generally to serious anti-social behavior (Comstock, 1978, p.14.)

In the new NIMH study, the key comment on the impact of violence was that after ten more years of research, the consensus among most of the research community is that violence on television does lead to aggressive behavior by children and teenagers who watch the programs (Walsh, 1982, p.804). This conclusion is based on laboratory ex-

periments and on field studies. Not all children become aggressive, of course, but the correlations between violence and aggression are positive (p.804).

As is evident, the issues of causality and catharsis are sensitive, with few wishing to bite the hand that feeds them. One of the more sensible statements comes from Halloran:

> We may not be quite ready to accept the direct link findings. We can accept that the heavy dosage of violence in the mass media, although not a major determinant of crime and delinquency, heightens the probability that someone in the audience will behave aggressively in a late situation. The catharsis fallacy is by no means the only one in this field of discussion. Statements from all sides, from producers, professional critics, and over-enthusiastic moralizers, show that the whole debate on the effects of...televised violence is riddled with misconceptions (Halloran in Larsen, 1968, p.147).

ACTION MEANS VIOLENCE

For broadcasters to be successful, they must design programming which will be what the general public likes; however, the extreme pressures of broadcasting forbid any unusual diversion from tried and true formulaic concepts (Brown, 1975, p.199). The most successful formulaic concept is the shoot-'em-up (Esslin, 1982, p.88) in which the level of violence is raised to a higher level with each

ensuing scene. Evidence that viewers require more and more excitement to achieve a satisfactory level of enjoyment has been shown to correlate with perception of the roughness of an event (Bryant, Comisky and Zillman, 1981). Action then becomes synonymous with violence, and broadcasts are editorially composed to accent this relationship (Epstein, 1973, p.104). Football is also another tried and true formula with a huge audience (Brown, 1975, p.201).

Since a major imperative of networks is to hold the attention of as many viewers as possible, producers are expected to put together a show that has continuous interest to a highly disparate audience, ranging from preschool children to the elderly. Possibly the only element of television that is presumed to have "holding power," as an NBC producer termed the quality, for all segments of the audience is visual action, or pictures which are considered exciting (Epstein, 1973, p.195).

The association between action and violence in entertainment was summarized in a masterpiece of understatement by Warren J. Ashley of NBC Broadcast Standards. A Maryland teacher who works with the NCTV had 137 of her grade school students send a petition to NBC asking for less violence on The A-Team. Ashley's response follows:

> The A-Team is a fantasy program...In real life, shooting guns, especially automatic weapons, would result in serious wounds, if not death. In The A-Team, despite all the shots that are fired, no one has ever been hurt by a bullet. Because no one is hurt, we feel the fighting, shooting, and car crashes in The A-Team are action, not violence (People, 30 January, 1984, p.63).

In the same article, NBC President Brandon Tartikoff leaves no uncertainty as to his feelings with regard to those opposed to the violence on the A-Team:

> I've spent an hour with Mr. T, the toughest guy on TV. I've spent an hour with NCTV people. They scare me more than anyone I've seen on The A-Team. I think it's a dangerous mentality to go around and try to legislate what all TV should look like. As long as 42 million people keep watching the television, I don't see any reason for change... (People, p.63).

The millions who do watch TV are receiving signals in the form of the content of the telecast and the symbolic functions which they represent in general. As to the implications of the symbolic functions of televised sports violence, Berger has analyzed football semiologically, with special attention given to various sign subsystems such as the dress of the players, officials, signs in the stands, and other matters. More importantly, for our purposes, he outlines the precise manipulation of time by television networks using the instant replay. Berger

argues that "the clock" is one of the crucial signs to the understanding of what football means, in its televised form in particular.

> Ultimately, time doesn't pass the way it does in real life. We keep seeing the past (a given play) over and over again from a variety of angles, so that our sense of continuity and perspective are rendered problematic. Televised football has become an incredibly sophisticated art form and now closely resembles avant-garde films in that both now simulate stream of consciousness thought which moves backward and forward in time, jumping around almost incoherently at times. Instant replay is vaguely equivalent to the flashback in films, and the invention of instant replay has dramatically altered the nature of televised football, in particular, and the modern American sensibility, in general (Berger, 1982, pp.123-4).

SUMMARY

The specific limitations of effects-oriented research are considerable. Admittedly, much more research, especially longitudinal studies, needs to be completed before the gap between the sterility of the laboratory and real-life may be adequately abridged. However, these experiments are crucial starting-points and may in years to come be regarded as the beginning of a vital new breakthrough in mass media research into violence.

After reviewing the evidence, it becomes clear that the business of broadcasting has changed the institution

of sports, imposing itself on games and events with such freedom that the supposedly unscripted live event has become a rather complex chain of production decisions all run by the producer's stopwatch. since the most primary factor of influence for broadcasters to interest themselves in telecasting sports is revenue, failure in commercial sports is a major catastrophe. "When ratings fall, the price of stock also drops, and heads roll" (Brown, 1975, p.143).

There is no uncertainty as to the reasons behind all violent fare. Baldwin and Lewis (1972) offer an eloquent summation of what motivates network programmers in their government sponsored research:

> The character of television programs is determined by the three networks' notions of what will appeal to large numbers of people, sell products or services for advertisers, and not jeopardize the valuable licenses or the goodwill of affiliates by creating a negative audiences response (pp.17-18).

There is simply little or no interest on the part of the networks to regulate themselves responsibly (Bryant, 1984). The media task force of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence examined the three networks to see if their efforts conformed to their own versions of the now defunct National Association of Broad-

casters (NAB) Code. The task force summarized their findings of the network presentation of violence:

> Present network standards on portrayals of violence are weak because they appear to be based on little more than a fear of losing viewers. Little consideration is given to the issue of whether violence is indeed necessary to maintain dramatic tension in the resolution of conflict, and only cursory attention is even paid to the large question of reducing the number of violent programs in network entertainment schedules (Liebert, 1973, p.146).

If violence is condoned by society, the fans, by business, the networks and their advertisers, and by willing participants who are functionally involved in sports, the athletes, coaches and trainers, how can those opposed to sports violence and the replaying of violent incidents in sports television change the system? These questions need clarification as long as longitudinal studies of violence and television continue to neglect the importance of televised sports violence as an area of research.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the author will reveal his personal interest in the question of televised sports violence and offer solutions to the problems of studying this issue. This chapter consists entirely of opinion, and should therefore be read with this in mind. Conclusions will be drawn from the research presented in the previous chapters and also from other more general sources, which are cited herein.

Historical and analytical treatments of sports and television have focused primarily on certain key issues; the financial importance of televised sports to both the promoters and the television industry, the influence of television on the way sports are played and presented, the impact of televised sports on viewers, and the role of sports on television in social relations. However, these approaches have obscured less glamorous areas of research which are important in the overall understanding of the relationship between sports and television. One important area which has been virtually ignored by researchers is the understanding of televised sports violence.

Televised violence, unlike books, motion pictures, and plays, reaches millions of people every hour. The audience, of course, includes people of all ages and socio-economic backgrounds. Television, conservatively, has affected every aspect of American life. It has changed the very core of many lives. In fact, the absence of television in social relations constitutes an abrupt alienation from the intimacy and psychological support of a television environment. Since television in the 1980s now seems to function as a continuous accompaniment to the domestic environment, a background for other activities, it has become easier not to watch television than to watch it. This makes advertisers nervous.

For advertisers to want to buy time, the networks must guarantee a specific loyal audience. This has necessitated a dramatic improvement in the quality of production techniques, making the most advanced technical effect commonplace. since it is injurious for a broadcaster to endorse anything but programs of the highest possible quality in this highly competitive market, broadcasters essentially create their own destinies in terms of production decisions. Thus, a broadcaster who reduces the amount of violent replays in sports programming would be risking their relative security in the business on an inferior product. The spectator has come to demand multi-

angle replays in sports television, and what broadcasters perceive as what the viewer wants is the bottom line.

The question "How were the replays?" is perhaps the best indicator of the success or failure of football telecasts for fans, but to broadcasters the main question will always be, "What were the numbers (ratings)?" It is ironic that the networks persist in displaying graphic violence because with all the studies that have been done, and the discussions of violence that have followed, it is not conclusive that violence increases ratings (Bryant, 1984).

Television, because it can convey violence more vividly than other media, makes the elimination of displays of aggression problematical. Hopes for any improvement appear to lie in enough players and owners of sports teams reaching the conclusion that pure sport can attract customers without designated "goons" beating up on one another in front of the ever-present camera.

Promoters willingly condone aggressive and violent behavior to provide fans with the "entertainment" they want, with broadcasters providing the suitable backdrop, allowing fans to focus their attention on the "physical aspects" of the game. Indeed. when the action on the

field isn't satisfying enough, fans have been known to respond violently. Consequently, as fans are taught to expect violence in sports, their tolerance increases. Then there is the danger that "a good fight" or "a lot of action" on the field may lead to violent or aggressive behavior among fans, while athletes are exploited in the zest of broadcasters' success at financial planning.

"Serious sport," write George Orwell, "has nothing to do with fair play. It is bound up with hatred, jealousy, boastfulness, disregard for all rules, and sadistic pleasure in witnessing violence. In other words, it is war minus the shooting" (Orwell in Atyeo, 1977, p.279). The sanitized rituals that are a part of sports participation often determine the nature of the battle. In hockey, players throw down their gloves to the ice in remarkably similar fashion to the medieval throwing down of the gauntlet. Sports today provides enough of this medieval mania--the broken neck of a race driver, skier or football player, the bean ball, the chewed-off ear of a wrestler, the damaged eye of a hockey player, the death of a boxer (Atyeo, p. 280).

If sports violence fulfills as many psychological, social and economic needs as it appears to, can it be eliminated without eliminating sports? To oppose violence in

sports is not to condemn sports themselves. On the contrary, to condemn brutality in our play is to recognize how important our play has become. Yeager suggests a way:

> We need desperately to change our attitudes about the sports we play and watch. Ice hockey, a beautiful sport, a sport of skill, endurance and strength, has been robbed of its grace, stripped of its symmetry, by coaches and managers convinced that fans only want fights and violence. Is it so difficult to believe that we can enjoy sports in another way? (Yeager, 1979, p.243).

Sports broadcasters create a product which commands great attention, and is very popular among advertisers. Is it unnecessarily violent? Broadcasters would have trouble including violent replays in their list of top concerns within the industry, especially because they see replays as essential to successful sports programming because of the ability of the video tape machine to condense huge segments of time and space into easily presentable packages of "information" or "entertainment." For a director to choose a less violent action sequence over a violent one, he/she must have a pretty good reason. Job security is too important for people to start making decisions that go against the formula that equates action with violence. Broadcasters have adopted the replay format as their man vehicle designed to give viewers a glimpse of a variety of sports or events. This is best

accomplished with the instant replay of action scenes. There are dozens of images to choose from, but vivid visuals are what count.

The networks glorify the "intensity" of sports by emphasizing the most violent aspects of games which often involve extensive coverage of injuries. It is not surprising that some players still shy away from the lucrative exposure of the video camera; they have been on the receiving end of such invasive coverage. Directors make a living out of showing the contrast of competition, and the ensuing emotional conflict, or "human conflict" as it is better known. They look for shots that will be memorable to viewers, rather than forgettable, because of their emotional component. The reaction shot, "worth a thousand words," though perhaps insensitive, makes great sports television. A recent example is the reaction shot of Detroit Lions coach Monte Clark, with hands clasped together, praying for his kicker, Eddie Murray, to kick the game-winning field goal which would put them into the 1983 NFL Championship. The perfect drama building, gut wrenching reaction shot. Murray missed.

SUMMARY

Given the fact that the broadcast media are licensed to serve the public, and that by serving the public vast amounts of revenue are created, certain assumptions may be made. The first is that broadcasters won't do anything that will jeopardize their steady flow of money. The second is that barring a change in the First Amendment, broadcasters will continue to consider any direct influence which shapes program content unacceptable. If the mass media are supposed to self-regulate, which has never proved to be a reliable method of managing the complex question of maintaining responsibility to the public, how does the public check to make sure that broadcasters are making adequate changes which reflect public sentiment?

Social science researchers can help answer this by doing several things to ease the burden that has frustrated sports violence specialists:

1. Treat the structural elements of broadcasts as a separate research issue.

The violent structural elements of broadcasts are rarely treated as a separate issue, thus the importance of violent replays is seen only in light of the overall coverage of an event. Audiences see images which are

there as a matter of choice. Therefore, it is of extreme importance for researchers to explore the source of the broadcast itself. The shot-by-shot analysis of television, though painstaking and riddled with the pitfalls of content analysis, would add to an area of sports violence research that is sadly lacking.

2. Explore more carefully the role and contribution of the director to broadcasts.

The directorial decision making process in television needs research emphasis just as film has recognized the importance of the director, as represented in Auteur theory. Television producers and writers get the lion's share of attention in both the press and in research, yet there isn't any trend to give the director his/her due. Many outsiders are not aware of what a director has to cope with. With added research on directors, researchers would be able to expand on the coverage of events, specifically, how the decision-making process relates to network production organization. In other words, do directors operate totally on personal tendencies or instincts in key situations, or are there policies outlining their expected behavior? Since the role of a director is a crucial element of broadcasting, it should receive appropriate research attention.

3. Examine production meetings for clues as to what network tendencies or standards exist for coverage of violent sports.

Though access to directors is, in large part, the reason why so little is known about them, insiders will tell you that production meetings are where the specifications and expectations of each broadcast are detailed, and to more formally examine these meetings is to examine the heart of broadcasters' efforts. However, getting information about directorial tendencies and the focus of production meetings too often comes second-hand, and story telling by the likes of Fred Friendly and David Halberstam is juicy, and hearsay.

4. Include sports as a subject of research in longitudinal studies on the issue of violence and the mass media.

Though they cannot say for certain whether there is a causal relationship between watching televised violence and subsequent aggressive behavior, researchers continue the study of televised violence in the hopes that someday broadcasters will see that it is in their own interest to reduce the amount and expectation of violence in their programming. Including sports as an area of research by performing longitudinal studies of sports violence is an

essential starting ground. Unless there is clear evidence of potential harm of violence, broadcasters will respond inconclusively about the role of research. Longitudinal studies are needed to shore up the weak facade of sports violence research and to give broadcasters one less excuse for the inclusion of violence in their programming.

5. Induce broadcasters to be more cooperative in research pursuits.

Broadcasters may make it easier for researchers to study them someday, and then the public could appreciate the intense pressure broadcasters are under, while simultaneously opening the door for a better understanding of the issue of violence in televised sports. Meanwhile, if economic restrictions were placed on those who released a consistently high level of violent programming, some change might come. While the FCC seldom, if ever, resorts to drastic measures to settle controversy, such as revoking licenses, maybe this would induce broadcasters to be more attentive to the needs of the public. However, this is highly unlikely.

In the networks' lust for profits, they have sought to re-write the fundamental tenets of broadcasting. The obligations of the Fairness Doctrine and other monopolistic

constraints have given broadcasters the ammunition they need to persuade the Republican-conscious FCC to resolve controversial issues in broadcasting with a favorable eye on them.

Unfortunately for the public, broadcasters are not as skilled as market competitors as they are as monopolizers. The various restraints on broadcasting, though dwindling in number, are in place for a reason. Broadcasters have shown that self-regulation, though most desired by all parties, is impractical, unethical, and problematical. For these reasons, these rules must stay in place. Though broadcasters may have good intentions, that is not reason enough for them to ignore vital areas of their legislated responsibility.

In the previous chapters, the author laid a foundation for the understanding of the factors which influence or contribute to the replaying of violence in sports programming. Specifically two models were outlined to show the system under which broadcasters function in relation to the main question at hand: the economic imperatives of the industry were shown to conflict with idealistic general policy statements regarding the appropriate and responsible use of the medium of television; the psychological implications of programming, as well as research

into effects of violent television content were rejected as "best evidence" by broadcasters who argued that there is no problem with what they choose to show.

Because of the great power of television, for now, we know that violence on television is either something we are going to learn to live with or learn how to change. As the prominence of television in the lives of Americans has steadily increased since its introduction a little more than a quarter century ago, so has the place of sports on television. Unfortunately, the broadcast industry resists any change in their sports coverage which they believe would hurt ratings, such as reducing the incidence of replays, whether violent or not. So, the system will likely stay the way it is unless the content of television is more strictly regulated by the FCC which is extremely unlikely given its current ideological, deregulatory thrust.

"Only one license in America need be taken away for disservice to the public through overindulgence in violent programming, and the system would be reformed overnight" (Brown, 1975, p.145). Until then, however, broadcasters will serve their own vested interest to the exclusion of those whom they are licensed to serve.

REFERENCES

BOOKS:

Atyeo, D. Blood and guts. New York & London: Paddington Press, 1979.

American Psychological Association, Publication Manual, 2nd edition, 1974.

Ball, D.W. & Loy, J.W. Sport and social order: Contributions to the sociology of sport. Reading, MA: Addison - Wesley, 1975.

Berger, A.A. Media analysis techniques. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1982.

Brody, S. Screen Violence and film censorship - a review of research. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1977.

Casebier, A. & Casebier, J.J. (eds.). Social responsibilities of the mass media. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1978.

Cline, V.B. (ed.). Where do you draw the line?. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1974.

Comstock, G.A. & Rubenstein E.A. (eds.) Television and social behavior, Vol 1.: Media Content and Control. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1972, pp.28-182.

Comstock, G., Chaffee, S., Katzman, N., McCombs, M. & Roberts, D. Television and human behavior. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.

Cummings, R. "Double play and replay: Living out there in television land." In E. Snyder (ed.), Sports: A social scoreboard, Bowling Green State University: Popular Pres, 1979

Epstein, E.J. News from nowhere. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.

Esslin, M. The age of television. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1982.

Fireman, J. TV book. New York. Workman Publishing Company, 1977.

Frost, R.B. & Sims, E.J. (eds.). Development of human values through sports. Washington, D.C.: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1974.

Goldstein, J.H. (ed.). Sports violence. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1983.

Halberstam, D. The powers that be. New York: Dell, 1979.

Hoch, P. Rip off the big game: The exploitation of sports by the power elite. Garden City, NY.: Anchor Books, 1972.

Howitt, D. Mass media violence and society. New York, Halstead Press, 1975.

Johannesen, R.L. Ethics in human communication. Ohio: Northern Illinois University, 1975.

Kramer, J. Instant replay. New York: World Publishing Co., 1968, p.262.

Krasnow, E.G., Longley, L.D. & Terry, H.A. The politics of broadcast regulation. New York: St. Martins Press, 1982.

Lange, D.L., Baker, R.K. & Ball, S.J. Mass media and violence, Vol. XI, Washington: USGPO, 1969.

Larsen, O. Violence and the mass media. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Leonard, W.M. A sociological perspective of sport. Minneapolis, MN.: Burgess Publishing Co., 1980.

Liebert, R.M., Neale, J.M. & Davidson, E.S. The early window: Effects of television on children and youth. Elmsford, NY.: Pergamon Press, 1973.

Litman, B.R. The vertical structure of the broadcast industry: The coalescence of power. Michigan State University, 1979.

Loy, J.W., McPherson, B.D. & Kenyon, G. Sport and social systems. Reading, MA.: Addison - Wesley, 1978.

Mankiewicz, F. & Swerdlow, J. Remote control. New York: Balantine Books, 1978.

Metz, R. CBS: Reflections in a bloodshot eye. New York: Signet, 1975.

McLuhan, H.M. Understanding media: The extensions of man. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Michener, J.A. Sports in America. New York: Fawcett Crest, 1976.

Mills, C.W. The power elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Noll, R.C., Peck, M.J. & McGowan, J.J. Economic aspects of television regulation. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1973.

Rowland, W.D., Jr. The politics of tv violence. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983.

Skornia, H.J. Television and society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Smith P. Babel. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1978.

Snyder, E. Sports: A social scoreboard. Bowling Green State University: Popular Press, 1975.

Tan. A.S. Mass communication theories and research. Columbus, Ohio: Grid Publishing, Inc., 1981.

Tucker, R.C. (ed.). The Marx-Engels reader. Norton, 1972.

Whetmore, E.J. Mediamerica. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1982.

Withey, S.B. & Abeles, R.P. (eds.). Television and social behavior: Beyond violence and children. Hilsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1980.

Wright, C.R. Mass Communication: A sociological perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Random House, 1975.

Yeager, R.C. Seasons of share: The new violence in sports. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Zettl, H. Sight, Sound & Motion, Belmont, California, Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973.

JOURNAL ARTICLES

Bandura, A., Ross, D. & Ross, S. Vicarious reinforcement and imitative learning. Journal of abnormal and social psychology, 1963, 67, pp.601-7.

Bryant, J. Comisky, P. & Zillman, D. Drama in sports commentary. Journal of communication, 1977, 27.

_____. The appeal of rough and tumble play in televised professional football. Communications quarterly, Fall 1981.

Bryant, J., Brown, D., Comisky, P. & Zillman D. Sports and spectators; Commentary and appreciation. Journal of communication, Winter 1982, 32.

Comisky, P., Bryant, J. & Zillman, D. Commentary as a substitute for action. Journal of communication, Summer 1977, 27.

Goldstein, J.H. & Bredemeier, B.J. Socialization: Some basic issues. Journal of communication, Summer, 1977, 27, pp.156-60.

Horrow, R.B. Journal of Legislation, Vol. 9:1-15, 1982.

Parente, D. The interdependence of sports and television. Journal of communication, Summer, 1977, 27.

Somers, A. Violence, television and the health of american youth. New england journal of medicine, April 8, 1976, Vol. 294:15, p.11.

Williams, B. The structure of televised football. Journal of communication, Summer, 1977, 27.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Brown, L. in Symposium on tv violence. Ontario, Canada: Research Branch of the Canadian Radio/Televison Commission, 1975.

Catton, W.R., Mass media as activators of latent tendencies, in Lange, Baker & Ball (eds.). Mass media and violence. Washington: USGPO, 1969.

Gerbner, G. Violence in television drama: Trends and symbolic functions. In Comstock, G.A., & Rubenstein, E.A. (eds.), Television and social

behavior. Vol 1: Media content and control. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1972, pp.27-182.

Goransen, R.E. A review of recent literature on psychological effects of media portrayals of violence, in Lange, Baker & Ball (eds.), Mass media and violence. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1969.

Ontario royal commission on violence in the communications industry. Toronto, Ontario: Royal commission on violence, 1976.

Symposium on television violence. Ottawa, Canada: Radio-Television commission, 1976.

U.S. Congress. Communications act of 1934.

U.S. Congress. House of Representatives. Hearings before the subcommittee on communications. 94th Congress. 2nd session. On the issue of televised violence and obscenity. Washington, DC.: USGPO, August 17-8, 1976, p.109.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on commerce. Subcommittee on communications. Hearings. 92nd Congress, 1st session. On progress report. Scientific advisory committee on tv and social behavior. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1971.

NEWSPAPER CLIPPINGS

Bayless, S. The replay's not always the thing. Dallas Times Herald, 1/10/84.

Bell, T. Tommy Bell has doubts about replays. Washington Star, 1/24/81.

Carlsen, C. Deterring players' violence on the field. New York Times, 12/19/82.

Dickey, G. The case for full-time NFL officials. S.F. Chronicle, 1/19/84, p.67.

Dougan, M. Feeling violent today? S.F. Chronicle, 1/12/84, p.B9.

Gerbner, G. Exploring tv's hold on viewers. Miami Herald, 5/23/82, Section E.

Gilmore, T. Madden, CBS, get high marks, ref's, NBC plunks. S.F. Chronicle, 1/9/84, p.43.

Livingston, P. Forget talk of instant replays; to err is human. Pittsburgh Press, 1/9/80.

Martin, D. Violence for the sport of it. S.F. Chronicle, 8/31/82, Sunday Punch, p. 4.

McKenzie, M. NFL should use instant replays. Kansas City Times, 1/9/80, p.1D.

O'Flaherty, T. The dangerous tags in television's attic, S.F. Chronicle, 9/28/83, p.62.

Page, A. The violence act comes up short. Sport, February, 1981, p.10.

Robbie, J. Dolphin head says violence threatens future of sports. The Sun, 5/20/81.

Ryan, A.J. Violence in sports: What and why it is. N.Y. Times, 5/29/77, S-2.

Scannell, N. Instant replays might not do better. Minnesota Star, 1/7/80

Stokes, G. Village Voice, 9/26/82, p.14.

Quinn, G. Director: Replay won't help refs. Philadelphia Daily News, 8/27/78, p.86.

Wireless Flash, no. 323. San Diego: Copley Radio Network, 9/12/83.

MAGAZINES

Panorama, vol. 2, no. 1, January 1981.

People, 1/30/84, p.62.

Time, 4/5/82, p.80.

TV Guide, November 5, 1977, p.6.

UNPUBLISHED PAPERS

Cohen, D. Television's impact on the structure of American sports. Unpublished manuscript, 1982 (available from BCA department, San Francisco State University).

OTHER

ABC News, Viewpoint, February 24, 1983.

Brown, L. in Symposium on tv violence. Ontario, Canada: Research Branch of the Canadian Radio/Television Commission, 1975.

Cummings, R., Double play and replay: Living out there in television land. In E. Snyder (ed.), Sports: A social scoreboard. Bowling Green State University: Popular Press, 1979.

Halloran, J.D. Television and violence. In Larsen, O. (ed.) Violence and the mass media. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

National coalition on tv violence. Press releases 1980-1985.

Nielsen newscast, No. 2, 1982. Northbrook, Illinois: A.C. Nielsen Company.

Riger, R., in Fireman, J. TV book. New York: Workman Publishing Co., 1977.

Tutko, T. on KCBS Radio, April 9, 1979.

Webster's new world dictionary, Springfield, Mass.: G & C Merriam Publishers, 1970, p. 1585.